

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 15 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 15 have been amended.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated, "nowhere in applicants disclosure, mainly sections outlined by applicant does the disclosure teach two separate lists that are presented to the user for selecting a training course." See Advisory Action, page 2, paragraph 3 [*sic*].

Applicants respectfully submit that the statement is incorrect, as the specification clearly indicates that there are two lists. For example, the specification states:

A course application standard individual conversion table 14 shows the correspondence between the course in the course application reception standard information 12 and the course in the client company application system information 13, and *also shows the similarity level between corresponding courses.*

See specification of the present invention, page 20, lines 3-13 [emphasis added]. See *also* FIG. 2. Therefore, the present invention includes a similarity level between the courses in the course application reception standard information and the courses in the client company application system information. This information represents a first list.

The specification further states:

The training company rejection system information 15 shows the title, summary, object, period, price, etc. of each training course prepared by a training company. The information about each course is compared with the information about each course in the reception standard information 12. As described later, the course reception standard individual conversion table 16 showing the correspondence between a standard course and a training course, and the similarity level between the courses is generated. A similarity level is determined in the data mining method, etc. as described above.

See specification of the present invention, page 20, line 22 – page 21, line 9. See *also* FIG. 2. Therefore, the present invention includes a similarity level between the courses prepared by a training company and the standard courses. This information represents the second list.

The lists are separate lists. For example, as illustrated in FIG. 9, the first list pertains to the similarity comparison between a standard course and a client company course. As illustrated in FIG. 11, the second list pertains to a similarity comparison between a standard course and a training company course. See specification of the present invention, page 31, lines 14-19 and page 32,

lines 2-8. As recited in the claims, the user is provided with capability to select from the first list and the second list. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Applicants are uncertain as to whether the Examiner is maintaining the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 1-12 and 15, as Applicants' previous response was not addressed in the Advisory Action. Nevertheless, Applicants respectfully submit that the original disclosure of the present invention clearly discloses that the user selects from both client company training and training company training.

For example, the specification clearly states, "... the titles of the client company courses provided for the application by an employee on the client company are displayed to an applicant for training, and the applicants for training select one of the courses." See specification of the present invention, page 27, lines 1-5. Therefore, the user selects from the client company training. The specification also clearly states, "In this process, the information about the titles and so forth of the training courses having higher similarity levels, etc. is sequentially displayed in order. . . The applicant for training selects any of the displayed courses." See specification of the present invention, page 28, lines 5-11. Therefore, the user selects from the training company training.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection, as the disclosure clearly and fully supports the claims of the present invention.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,576,954 (Driscoll).

Driscoll is directed to a procedure for determining text relevancy. According to Driscoll, a first embodiment determines common meanings between each word in a query and each word in a document. An adjustment is then made for words in the query that are absent in the documents. Weights are then calculated for both the semantic components in the query and the semantic components in the documents. The weights are then multiplied together, and their products are subsequently added to one another to determine real value number for each document. The documents are then sorted in sequential order according to their real value number from largest to smallest.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 4, 7-12, and 15 are patentable over the references, as Driscoll fails to disclose or suggest:

wherein the first and second similarity levels are obtained based on importance levels of words included in respective training application information, said importance levels calculated by dividing

an occurrence probability of a particular word by a sum of a frequency of all words appearing in respective text
, as recited in currently amended independent claim 1, for example.

Although Driscoll discloses a calculation relating to the "importance" of each word, the "importance" is determined by the base-10 logarithmic function of the total number of documents to be searched divided by the number of documents in which the word appears. See Driscoll, column 7, lines 13-16. Therefore, Driscoll does not disclose a calculation in which importance levels calculated by dividing an occurrence probability of a particular word by a sum of a frequency of all words appearing in respective text as in the present invention.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9/18/07

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501